

REMARKS


Applicant has elected Group II for further prosecution. However, applicant requests reconsideration of the restriction requirement, in view of the reason for the restriction appearing in the official action. Applicant believes that all claims should be searched in the same class or classes, because all claims are directed to method or apparatus for compression refining of pulp. Although as the examiner has noted, some claims require rolls, whereas other claims do not, all claims expressly or inherently require compression between relatively moving beating surfaces.

Claim 1 recites "said beating surfaces having a differential speed"; claim 7 recites "two beating surfaces defined by confronting rolls"; and claim 27 recites "said beating surfaces having a differential speed". Granted, claims 1 and 27 do require confronting roll surfaces, but all claims in essence require confronting surfaces that are in relative compressive motion.

With respect to the elected claims, numbers 9, and 11 have been preliminarily amended for clarity and more direct antecedent basis.

The description in the specification has been amended to correct self-evident or typographical errors.

Respectfully submitted,
Helmuth GABL

By: 

L. James Ristas
Registration No. 28,663
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicant

Date: February 2, 2006
750 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103
(860) 527-9211
Our Ref: ANDPAT/186/US

\\Alix-pw3hy3s5je\AYR\AYR saved docs\Filing Docs\Andpat\andpat186us\andpat186us013106amdt.doc